

### ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on April 24, 2007. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and interview, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

First, applicant notes that the Examiner has not indicated whether the drawings are accepted.

Claims 2-59 and 61-73 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 60 have been canceled. New claims 74-76 are added without adding any new matter. Note that new claims 74-76 are supported by the material discussed on page 14, first paragraph, of the specification. Further amendments to the claims are supported by the specification, including material provided in the fifth paragraph on page 3 of the specification, the second full paragraph on page 8 of the specification, and the first three paragraphs of page 14 of the specification.

Claims 2, 20, 21, 26-29, 31, 32, 40, 47, and 69-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ritter (WO 99/35771) in view of Baba *et al.* (E.P. 791901 A2). Claims 19 and 22-25 were rejected as above in further view of Baumann (U.S. 6,104,922). Claim 30 is rejected as for claim 69, in further view of Goldstein *et al.* (U.S. 5,410,326), claim 43 is rejected as for claim 69 in further view of Crosby *et al.* (U.S. 6,628,928) and claim 48 in further view of Yurino *et al.* (U.S. 6,810,386). For the following reasons, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed at the personal interview, the cited prior art fails to teach any customized entry mask where the fields are specifically customized to the selected product or service. Accordingly, claim 69 has been amended to recite that “wherein at least certain order parameters are used for adapting an entry mask displayed by the order program according to the selected offer, wherein adapting said entry mask comprises customizing the number of entry fields to the selected product or service” and where the

user the user uses “the personal terminal for entering the order data into the entry mask, including filling out said fields that are customized to the selected product or service such that said order data is customized to the selected product or service”. Claims 71 and 72 recite similar limitations. The Examiner agreed, at the interview, that such limitations should overcome the cited references.

Finally, the Examiner has not provided the proper motivation for combining the references. The Examiner merely lists a generalized advantage of the combination based on a benefit of the secondary reference. This is not proper. Merely listing an advantage or benefit of the combination is not sufficient, as some rationale for combining the references must be found in the references themselves, or drawn from a convincing line of reasoning based on established scientific principles practiced by one skilled in the art that some advantage or beneficial result would be produced by the combination (MPEP §2144). Such motivation cannot be found in the application itself, as such hindsight is impermissible; the facts must be gleaned from the prior art. (MPEP §2142, last paragraph).

Accordingly, the rejections for obviousness is not supported by the Office action and should be withdrawn.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/082,831  
Amdt. Dated May 14, 2007  
Reply to Office action of December 14, 2006

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. P&TS 34359.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By:           / Robert F. Bodi /          

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East Ninth Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

May 14, 2007